

Application No. 10/590,851
Filed: November 13, 2006
Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action

REMARKS

The present amendment and response is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed October 1, 2009. By the present amendment, Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 19, and 21 have been amended, and Claims 7, 13, and 18 have been canceled. New Claims 24-36 have been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-17, and 19-36 remain pending. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application as amended.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. More particularly, the Office Action indicates that dependent claims 2, 4, 7, 11, 13, and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Independent Claims 1 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,012,481 to Maekawa et al. (“Maekawa”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,914,500 to Hirabayashi (“Hirabayashi”) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,364,672 to Koes et al. (“Koes”).

Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of dependent Claim 7, and dependent Claim 7 has been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 is allowable. All of the dependent claims that ultimately depend from amended independent Claim 1 are likewise allowable as a matter of law as depending from an allowable base claim, notwithstanding their independent recitation of patentable features.

Similarly, Applicants have amended independent Claim 10 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of dependent Claim 13, and dependent Claim 13 has been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 10 is likewise allowable. All of the dependent claims that ultimately depend from amended independent Claim 10 are likewise

Application No. 10/590,851
Filed: November 13, 2006
Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action

allowable as a matter of law as depending from an allowable base claim, notwithstanding their independent recitation of patentable features.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 16-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. With respect to Claim 16, the Office Action indicated that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the LCP layer” in lines 4, 5, 9, and 10 of Claim 16. Applicants have amended Claim 16 to now recite “the high K organic layer” instead of the “LCP layer”. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the amendment can be found at least in FIG. 17E and in the accompanying portions of the specification referencing FIG. 17E. Based upon the foregoing amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants have amended independent Claim 16 to substantially incorporate the features of dependent Claim 18, and dependent Claim 18 has been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that these features incorporated into Claim 16 are similar to the allowable subject matter incorporated into currently amended independent Claims 1 and 10. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 16 is allowable for at least similar reasons discussed with respect to amended independent Claims 1 and 10 above. All of the dependent claims that ultimately depend from amended independent Claim 16 are likewise allowable as a matter of law as depending from an allowable base claim, notwithstanding their independent recitation of patentable features.

With respect to independent Claim 21, Applicants have amended that claim to clarify that “the first, second, third and fourth metal layers are patterned to form integrated components” and that the “integrated components” comprise “at least a first filter and a second filter connected by a common port”. Applicants’ undersigned representative believes that the foregoing amendments clarify the questions presented by the Office Action; however, if any questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative at the telephone number below. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/590,851
Filed: November 13, 2006
Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action

Newly Added Claims 25 – 36 are Allowable

Applicants respectfully submit that newly added independent Claim 25 is allowable over the art of record. Indeed, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the art of record teach or suggest the feature in independent Claim 25 of “wherein the first and second metal layers are patterned to form at least a first resonator, a second resonator, a third resonator, and a feedback capacitor, the third resonator connecting the first and second resonators, and the feedback capacitor connected in parallel with the third resonator.” For example, Maekawa illustrates a first stripline resonator 3a/3b and a second stripline resonator 4a/4b (See Maekawa, FIG. 2 and Col. 13, lines 23-26). However, in Maekawa, there is not a “third resonator connecting the first and second resonators”, as recited by Claim 25. Likewise, Maekawa also does not teach or suggest a “feedback capacitor connected in parallel with the third resonator”, as also recited by Claim 25. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 25 is allowable over Maekawa. Likewise, Hirabayashi, which is utilized by the Office Action to show a resin layer, does not cure the deficiencies of Maekawa. Similarly, Koes, which is utilized by the Office Action to show a prepreg composition, does not cure the deficiencies of Maekawa. All of the dependent claims that ultimately depend from amended independent Claim 25 are likewise allowable as a matter of law as depending from an allowable base claim, notwithstanding their independent recitation of patentable features.

Application No. 10/590,851
Filed: November 13, 2006
Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action

CONCLUSION

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-5029.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason V. Chang/

Jason V. Chang
Reg. No. 58,092

Date: **December 30, 2009**

SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP
999 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Direct: (404) 853-8685
Fax: (404) 853-8806

Sutherland Docket No. 19667-0028